



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

that the quotation is from one of Arndt's poems headed, "Unter den Sonnen." Under v. 147, Graf Eberhard der Rauschebart appears as an author. The sources of a number of quotations are not given at all; as, under v, 57; or merely the author, or book and chapter, or act and scene are given; as, under iii, 9, 22; ii, 157; v, 179; vi, 191; viii, 88. Under iii, 9, *Liebhabin* for *Liebhabin*, must be a misprint, but I cannot hunt up the source. Why are the O.H.G. and M.H.G. single words and quotations generally put in German type, when the accented vowels had to be put in Latin type? In the following notes the text is not quoted correctly: ii, 83; ii, 154, 167; vi, 253; ix, 51. Notes that are not clear, or cannot be made out at all, are those on i, 3 (last line), 122, 158, 195; ii, 57, 220; iv, 93; vi, 44; ix, 79. What is meant by "the expectation of the new scene is fore-indicated," on p. 131?

There are a number of what may be called belated notes. The one on v, 185 was evidently intended for i, 117 where *Kaarn* and *Wagen* occur together. The one on ii, 258 should have been on i, 21. If *selig* was to be translated at all, it should have been in ii, 90, not in ix, 17. There are six more of such notes, but some of them have references.

Some notes are inconsistent with each other, if not contradictory. Before the difference between *sondern* and *aber* has been stated in notes on v, 179 and vii, 52, *aber* is given as the force of *und* in ii, 98 and 110, when its force is clearly *sondern*. Under vi, 193, the primitive meaning of *milde* is said to be 'generously.' This does not harmonize with the statement under i, 13. *Gelassen* and *geduldig* are distinguished under ii, 27, yet in vi, 49 the first is translated by 'patient.'

While the notes are abundant and ample, some repeated and some *malapropos*, there are also those that are too meagre; and some points that should have had notes, in my opinion, have none. Under ix, 46, we are told that Lessing's little work 'Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet haben' (*sic*) had an incredible influence. How many students will know how, why? Under viii, 3 much is made of older *Blick* for the now common *Blitz*, but that *Blitz* is a derivative of *Blick* is not mentioned. The difficult construction: *er sagt es ihr denn*,

in iv, 43, needs more elucidation than a mere paraphrase with an added *nicht*. Students want to know where the *nicht* comes from. The phonetic relation of *dräuen* and *drohen* might have been explained under viii, 11. How is it, that Cæsar wore a wreath *aus Bedürfnis*, 'Elegie,' 18? The mere quoting of Heine's "Die Luft ist kühl und es dunkelt" does not explain *den dunkelnden Pfad* in viii, 38. Peculiar are *Fabriken* which means 'manufacture' in i, 58; *verdunkelt* in ii, 84; the accusative *wenige Stunden*, in iv, 193; *den Tag lebte*, in vi, 310; *an's Ohr hin*, in vii, 190; the dative *künftigen Zeiten*, in ix, 257; *in Sinn*, in iii, 107; *Stunden*, in v, 21; *mit Freuden*, in ii, 50; *bei Rat*, in iv, 175.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

Hamilton College.

### CHAUCER.

*Studies in Chaucer: His Life and Writings.*

By THOMAS R. LOUNSBURY, Professor of English in the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University. In three volumes. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892.

THE twenty-fifth birthday of the foundation of the Chaucer Society has been most fittingly celebrated. Professor Lounsbury's 'Studies in Chaucer' combine in forming a complete record and a critical appreciation of the multifarious results won from the researches of the past quarter of a century. It must have been a very pleasant duty for Professor Lounsbury to dedicate his work to Professor Child, the veritable pioneer in Chaucerian studies.

The readers of these three octavo volumes, covering over fifteen hundred pages of scholarly criticism, will congratulate themselves that the author could not find satisfaction in his earlier "intention of putting together in a compendious and easily accessible form the results of the latest investigations." Interesting indeed would have been a convenient summary of all the material gathered under the title of the publications of the Chaucer Society, but how much more intrinsically valuable are these exhaustive treatises which the writer concluded to set for his task.

In these eight chapters, each so written as to form a complete monograph in itself, Pro-

fessor Lounsbury approaches his subject essentially as a critic, for he has labored not merely to record former researches, but also to examine the possible value of those self-styled investigations. The biography of the poet elicits the first exercise of this critical faculty. Chaucer and Shakespeare have had voluminous biographies to offset the little that has been known of their lives. Professor Lounsbury has not thought it advisable to interweave the story-threads of the poet's life with some fantastic arrangement of his works. Professor ten Brink chose such a plan for his sketch of Chaucer in his 'History of English Literature,' despite the trouble and ill success he encountered in the disposition of so much undated material. On reading the scheme invented by Professor ten Brink one hardly agrees that the "ABC" poem bears a post-Italian stamp; that the tales of Virginia and Greselda, the preamble of the Wyf of Bath, the story of May and January offer many clues to assist in their arrangement. In chapter i, Professor Lounsbury rejects all traditional statements, presents the few dates and events now recognized as being the only true material for a biographical notice, and discusses at great length and with equally great thoroughness the question of the date of Chaucer's birth, leaving the reader at the end of forty pages with the happy information that "born sometime Chaucer certainly was."

In chapter ii we are led along a gallery of productions depicting a series of most romantic biographical legends. The author says that "in the biography of no other man of letters can there, perhaps, be found such a record" of absurd stories.

Before entering upon a criticism of the poet's works, time is called, and chapter iii tells of the text of Chaucer before and after the introduction of printing. The early editions have passed through much the same mode of treatment as the poet's biography—the more, the better. A tabulation of the various editions and their dates would have presented to the reader's eye a distinct outline of the facts related in the chapter itself.

Chapter iv, "the Writings of Chaucer," is not a critical review of the sources, subject-matter, motives and literary significance of the

poet's works, but a history of the method used in rejecting the spurious productions and saving the genuine. The ascription to Chaucer of all sorts of poetry regardless of all laws of criticism has brought into existence a number of remedies called "tests of genuineness" which Professor Lounsbury groups into two classes; the first including tests of personal or contemporary testimony, manuscript test, the grammatical test; the second, tests of dialect and rime, the *ye* and *y* test, rhetorical test, tests of volucular and others. The second class of tests is claimed to be corroboratory, but not conclusive. Take, for example, the poem entitled "The Flower and the Leaf." It is unpleasant enough to submit such a beautiful poem to this trial. As a poetic symbol, the contest between the flower and the leaf must have been familiar to Chaucer and his successors, for they could have read it not only in three poems by Eustache Deschamps, but also in a fourth ode bearing still closer resemblance to the poem before us. The first class of tests cannot be used, but the frequent employment of the *ye* and *y* rime, and the misuse of the rules for rime dependent upon grammatical terminations, are sufficient to prove the spuriousness of the poem. Not so easily dispatched is the "Romance of the Rose." The proofs for the unguineness of this work, collected by Professor Skeat, are weighty and numerous, in fact, weighty and numerous enough to win over Professor ten Brink. Yet there was plenty of room for controversy, and Professor Lounsbury has entered the field. How successfully? The reader alone must decide, for it is a question involving many and insoluble difficulties. It stands thus, the "strongest evidence against the genuineness of this version of the 'Roman de la Rose' is the auxiliary use of the present *do*," while the "strongest sort of evidence for its genuineness is the Chaucerian character of the translation." It is the constant occurrence of Chaucer's words, phrases, mannerisms, methods of translation as well as independent expressions, which goes to prove the genuineness of the poem and the insufficiency of Professor Skeat's arguments. But in advancing this so-called literary test, Professor Lounsbury readily foresaw a possible demurrer,

urging that all these various expressions which have been enumerated are not really distinctive; that the very inevitableness of their constant employment is of itself evidence that they cannot be so. It may be further maintained that Chaucer and the author of this translation were both doing no more than making use of the common phraseology of the time. It is true that the comparison of Chaucer's works with those of any contemporary must be inadequate, because "no great body of contemporary rhymed production of different authors exists." But is Gower the representative? Many of the words and phrases cited as notably frequent in Chaucer are stereotyped alliterative forms. Such phrases are: *soth to say, sothly to say, withouten wene, were, black as a berry, woundes . . wide, faire fresshe, swelte and swete*. What we wish to emphasize is that these are formal alliterative phrases, and as such are less known and employed by Gower than by any contemporary writer named or nameless. And equally inadequate for comparison seem to be the parallel passages selected from the genuine works of Chaucer. The subject requires much wider illustration than has been attempted in both this chapter and the appendix. The poetic vocabulary of Chaucer and his contemporaries is surprisingly traditional, is almost too formal and similar to allow a satisfactory line of proof.

Chapter v, "The Learning of Chaucer," is an interesting subject that has never before been presented so entertainingly. The frequent citation of authors and authorities, the many recently discovered originals and parallels evince an extensive, though perhaps not a scholarly, store of learning on the poet's part. If no praise is to be awarded Chaucer for knowing Latin and French in these words,

"To be an educated man at all, one had to know Latin. . . In some things French could take its place, but it could not fill it. Both of these tongues were the common possession of every one in England of the fourteenth century who aimed to be a man of letters at all. In knowing them Chaucer would have no special distinction over many of his contemporaries," we prefer to pass a few pages and read

"Chaucer, accordingly, could not have failed to meet with it [respect for knowledge of three languages besides his own] in an age

when familiarity with foreign tongues implied a great deal more than it does now."

It is not surprising that the great book of the Renaissance of literature, the 'Roman de la Rose,' should have made such an impression on the young English poet as to have colored his poetic vision more than "all other French poetry put together." Probably Chaucer began the translation of this great masterpiece and of Boethius's 'De Consolatione Philosophiae' in his youth, for we have hardly a piece of work from his pen in which their influence has not been felt. Among the French writers with whom Chaucer is styled acquainted is Eustache Deschamps. The latter's poem dedicated to the "great translator" confirms this claim though "not a single line of the English poet has so far been traced" to him. Froissart's name, then, should not have been omitted from this list of French writers. It is true that Chaucer's name occurs only in the chronicler's account of the negotiations of 1377 at Montreuil, but there is the borrowed passage, though who enjoys the obligation is a question, showing a literary indebtedness at least. And Professor Skeat writes:

"When we come to Chaucer we recognise in him one who was a great student of the poetry of France, and was well acquainted with the writings of Guillaume de Machault, Jean de Froissart and others."

The second volume closes with a review, chapter vi, of Chaucer's relation to the English language and to the religion of his time. Certainly the poet exercised a marked influence upon the language of his time, but just how to describe his attitude towards Wycliffe is a more difficult undertaking. Anything like a thorough treatise upon Chaucer's English and that of his contemporaries cannot be written until more research has been made. It is not enough to glance at the poet's vocabulary, to average up the French and Anglo-Saxon elements in it. Dr. Eugen Einkenel has given a model of the method necessary to such a task; it is eminently a work of comparison; it involves a study of phrases as well as of words; not only of Chaucer, but also of his contemporaries and predecessors. It is right to conclude that Chaucer's English became the language of English literature not

because he rejected and selected words, but because he made those already in use the medium of his own expression. Professor Lounsbury truly observes.

"His work, in consequence, was the first effectual barrier that literature raised against the rapid change then going on in our speech."

"Chaucer in Literary History" is entitled chapter vii. Interest in Chaucer is a just indicator of the literary taste of any age. All honor, therefore, is due the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for the admiration of the great English poet. The cultivation of Chaucer touched lowest point in the middle and end of the seventeenth century. The eighteenth still continued ignorant and indifferent with respect to him. This indifference, Professor Lounsbury says, resulted from the "lack of knowledge, and not from the lack of intelligence."

Tyrwhitt's edition of the "Canterbury Tales," in 1775, "heralded the coming of a new order of things." And admiration for the poet has enrolled many a name famous in English literature from the days of Wordsworth to Lowell. But in view of the pleasure stored up for the reader in the eighth and final chapter, it is impossible to tarry and discuss the modernization of Chaucer in orthography and pronunciation.

In this closing monograph Professor Lounsbury purposes to present Chaucer as a literary artist, to discuss the poet's characteristic qualities in order to uphold the assertion previously made that Chaucer was an artist in the "fabrication of his verse as well as in the construction of his plot and the telling of his story." In face of all the elaborate study made by Professor ten Brink, of an attempted construction of the poet's biography based on the technical development of his poetic genius and versification, is it not misleading to write?—

"In the various eulogistic tributes that have been paid to the poet, it is rare that it [the technical part of his work] has received even cursory notice. In none of them has it ever been credited with its full significance."

Certainly Chaucer's attitude towards literature was a critical one, yet that could not keep him from some of the evils of his age, and one of these was a something wont to be called "prolixity." But we are now told that this is

not it. It is his "improper introduction of extraneous matter," "this is a fault of constructive skill, but it is not a fault of expression."

There is no reason to fear that Sandras's attack upon Chaucer's originality will mislead the student of Chaucer. Professor Ebert met Sandras long since and conquered him. And who can forget those glowing words penned by Lowell (and we quote these because no mention is made of Mr. Lowell's essay on 'Chaucer')?—

"Chaucer seems to me to have been one of the most purely original of poets, as much so in respect of the world that is about us as Dante in respect of that which is within us. . . He is original, not in the sense that he thinks and says what nobody ever thought and said before, and what nobody can ever think and say again, but because he is always natural, because, if not always absolutely new, he is always delightfully fresh, because he sets before us the world as it honestly appeared to Geoffrey Chaucer, and not a world as it seemed proper to certain people that it ought to appear."

There are many traits of Chaucer which reveal the very highest type of originality, that conscious impulse to herald the dawn of the new birth, the renaissance, that prophetic glimpse into the sublimer realm of English literature, the drama.

This entire eighth chapter is a memorial of studious praise; it fearlessly sets forth the principles of true art and submits to their criticism an artist known by the author to be superior to their most searching tests. Professor Lounsbury has expressed an appreciation of that second greatest of English poets in words which will not fail to charm the reader, to awaken his enthusiasm and to instruct him, and the Professor's grand work will stamp this age as one that will be "reputed eminent for learning" because of the extent to which it has become learned in Chaucer and his writings.

The beauty and expensive dress of these volumes, their excellent typography and wide-margined pages are most complimentary to the skill and liberality of Professor Lounsbury's publishers.

CHARLES FLINT MCCLUMPHA.

*University of the City of New York.*